Tony Jury, Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Report for August 23rd, 2018 Board of Education Meeting

First of all please accept my apologies for not being able to make it tonight. Several items may need more explaining. As always, I’m eager to answer questions and help everyone have a good understanding of assessment and accountability. I have spent this Monday and Tuesday at a conference asking many of those same questions. I have gained knowledge that will help us move forward.

As you are aware, state assessment results were released in September. A new accountability system is in place, which has caused much confusion and some frustration. Accountability measures will continue to change as only part of the system is in place. The district is deep into our improvement planning process.

1. Accountability results
	1. All four schools have at least one TSI category. This means each school has a sub-population of students that have fell into the bottom 5% of all students. Our schools must develop improvement plans that include research based best practices to address these students. In order for a sub-population to be considered there has to be at least 10 students in that population. We will exit TSI the same way we entered. The identified population must show growth and score above the bottom 5%.
	2. **Areas of great concern**: We are behind the state average in proficiency in all categories except one. We are at the place where we have to recognize changes must take place.
		1. **District**
			1. 18% of IEP students scored proficient on Reading and 9% on Math
			2. 30.6% of English Learners scored proficient on Reading and 33.3% on Math
			3. 34.9% of Hispanic students scored proficient on Reading and 28.4% on Math
			4. 31.4% of Consolidated Student group scored proficient on Reading and 23.3% on Math
		2. **School**
			1. 49.7% of our elementary students scored proficient in Reading compared to the state average of 54.6%
			2. 55.2% of our middle school students scored proficient in Reading compared to the state average of 60%
			3. 28.6% of our high school students scored proficient in Reading compared to the state average of 45.4%
			4. 38.1% of our elementary students scored proficient in Math compared to the state average of 48.8%
			5. 48.7% of our middle school students scored proficient in Math compared to the state average of 47%
			6. 20% of our high school students scored proficient in Math compared to the state average of 37.5%
	3. Transition Readiness indicator at 67.4%. Very good!! Ranks high among other districts in Kentucky. This means that we are making sure opportunities are available to our students. We will continue to move forward in this area. When compared to neighboring districts we definitely compare well in most areas.
2. We are continuing our new teacher induction program. Our first PD session offered by mentor teachers will be Oct. 29th.
3. Title Programs are still in the KDE consultant review process. 95% of the application has been approved. It’s taken consultants over 30 days to review components of the application. This is a continuous loop. Once a revision is made then it must go before the consultant again.
4. The accountability system will change again for this year. The Office of Assessment and Accountability is meeting on Oct. 24 to discuss the new Growth indicator. Educational professionals are having a difficult time understanding how this indicator is calculated and explaining this measure to the general public may be a train wreck. The Associate Commissioner told us to expect this indicator to be tweaked or completely changed.
5. Each school and the district is currently entrenched in the Continuous Improvement Planning Process. Continuous Improvement Coaches from KDE have been working with us. We have completed our needs assessments and are now analyzing data. Types of data include the TELL Survey, parent and staff surveys and assessment. When doing this work there are two main questions to consider:

1. What is our current reality?

2. What are our priorities?

The academic and non-academic data leads me to the following focuses:

1. Literacy and Numeracy

a. Reading and Math proficiency

2. Requirement and Retention of Teachers (Culture)

3. Helping the whole child. (Social/Emotional Learning)

4. Marketing of our District (Culture)

a. Internal – Staff, Students & Parents

b. External – Business, Industry and Community

1. We are also having a robust conversation about what we are using as a local measure of proficiency, (interim assessments) and what we are offering to students that are not meeting the standards. The district has been using MAP, an assessment tool that measures students at three points throughout the year. Teachers use Compass Learning that pairs with MAP results to offer individualized instruction based on individual performance. Administers, teachers, students and parents have been expressing concerns about MAP and Compass Learning. We currently are exploring our options for a replacement.